



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/849,499	05/04/2001	WALDMANN	1324.028

EXAMINER	
TON	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1632	14

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) THAIAN N. TON (3) MARK COHEN
(2) DEBORAH CROUCH (4)

Date of Interview JUNE 26, 2003

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: OF RECORD

Identification of prior art discussed: NONE

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

DISCUSSED CLAIM AMENDMENTS AND EVIDENCE FOR
ENABLEMENT.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

Deborah Crouch

Interview for 09/849,499

Invention: Methods for producing long-term cultures of immature dendritic cells by culturing ES cells.

Final Rejection:

Specification is objected to because they haven't submitted a copy of the spec with a marked up version.

112, 1st ¶ They are enabling for long-term culture of immature dendritic cells wherein they culture mouse ES cells from the mouse ES cell line ESF116 under appropriate conditions (see claims). We argued that the state of the art is such that ES cells are not available. Applicants argue that it is common knowledge that other ES cell lines derived from 129/SV mice (a different cell line) are capable of supporting esDC growth. We argued that the specification is not enabling as filed – that they provided post-filing art to show they are *now* enabled. The spec doesn't provide teaching for using any other cell line to produce long-term cultures of immature dendritic cells.